



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/114,231	06/30/1998	ILAN GABRIEL CARON	84505	8985

7590 10/10/2003

LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER LTD
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA SUITE 4900
180 NORTH STETSON
CHICAGO, IL 606016780

EXAMINER

LAO, SUE X

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 10/10/2003

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory ActionApplication No.
09/114,231Applicant(s)
CaronExaminer
S. LaoArt Unit
2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED Sep 29, 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See attached.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: _____
- Claim(s) objected to: _____
- Claim(s) rejected: 67-76
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____
8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

S. Lao

Attachment

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. See the final office action for the examiner's position. In particular, applicant's argued that Vanderblit checks the type of an object which is located on a *remote* computer and applicant's object is received at the client computer (Remarks, page 6, last paragraph to page 7, second paragraph). The examiner respectfully disagrees. First, claims 67 and 72 do not specify where the sending application and the recipient application are located with respect to the first and the second message queuing machines. See claims 67 and 72. In other words, the claim language does not require nor preclude the sending application being located local or remote to the first message queuing machine and/or to the second message queuing machine. Similarly, the claim language does not require nor preclude the recipient application being local or remote with respect to the first message queuing machine and/or to the second message queuing machine. In other words, as claimed, the received object is not required to be located on the same machine as the recipient application. Second, Vanderblit teaches in one embodiment that the client computer and the server computer are the same computer (col. 17, line 28; col. 18, line 18; col. 19, line 49; col. 20, line 39). In other words, the sending and the recipient applications are both co-located with the received object on the same computer. Therefore, the combination of Dyer et al (U S Pat. 5,754,849), Microsoft (Microsoft Message Queue Server Reviewer's Guide) and Vanderbilt et al (U S Pat. 5,793,965) meets "the unserialized dictionary object received from the second message queuing machine" as recited in the amended claims 67 and 72.